



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,853	08/13/2001	Martin Melchior	Mo-6476/LeA 34,678	8274
157	7590	06/28/2006	EXAMINER	
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC			SERGENT, RABON A	
100 BAYER ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PITTSBURGH, PA 15205			1711	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/928,853	MELCHIORS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rabon Sergeant	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/29/02</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Art Unit: 1711

1. During a review of the documents in the application, it was discovered that reference AM on the PTO 1449, filed January 29, 2002, was incorrectly identified. Therefore, the examiner has corrected the PTO 1449; a copy of the corrected form is enclosed with this Office action.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blum et al. ('393) in view of EP 159117.

Blum et al. disclose water dispersible binder compositions comprising a urethane modified polyester polyol, derived from reactants that overlap those of applicants, and a blocked polyisocyanate component. See abstract and columns 3-6.

4. Though Blum et al. disclose numerous blocking agents for masking the polyisocyanate, patentees are silent regarding the use of pyrazole blocking agents. Still, the use of pyrazoles as

blocking agents for polyisocyanates that are to be incorporated into aqueous compositions in masked form was known at the time of invention. This position is supported by the teachings of EP 159117 at page 4, lines 4+. Additionally, the secondary reference discloses that a benefit of using the pyrazole blocking agents is that the deblocking temperature is significantly lower as compared to the deblocking temperature of other conventional blocking agents. Since lower deblocking temperatures require less energy input and, therefore, require less expense, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to utilize the pyrazole blocking agents within the primary reference, so as to obtain a coating system that is less expensive to apply.

5. The examiner's positions set forth within the previous Office action of December 13, 2005 have been maintained in their entirety. Applicants' attention is directed to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the previous action, and it is not seen that those remarks need to be repeated again. Applicants' arguments and the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration of April 10, 2006 have been considered; however, they are insufficient to overcome the prior art rejection. Firstly, applicants' declaration is not seen to be effective in dismissing or discounting what appears to be a clear teaching within the prior art. The examiner has previously set forth his rationale supporting why the primary reference is considered to teach that the crosslinking agent may be added prior to dispersion, and applicants' remarks are not seen to sway this rationale. Applicants have additionally argued that Blum et al. does not use any blocked isocyanates and that they are not dispersible in water. In response, this argument is not understood, because Blum et al. do, in fact, disclose blocked isocyanates and further teach at column 6, lines 12-17 that hydrophobic crosslinkers, which cannot be dispersed in water on their own, may be used, because the hydrophilic urethane-modified polyester resin can perform the function of an emulsifier.

Art Unit: 1711

Accordingly, Blum et al. are considered to teach how to disperse blocked isocyanates.

Furthermore, the examiner does not agree with applicants' characterization of the disclosure within lines 4 and 5 of page 4 of EP 159,117. Applicants state that the disclosure indicates that the reference shows that addition of the blocked crosslinker occurs after dispersion. However, applicants appear to be reading more into this disclosure than seems to be present. It is not seen that this disclosure provides any teaching as to when the crosslinker is to be added to the composition. In summation, for the above reasons and those set forth within the previous Office action, the prior art rejection is considered to be proper and has been maintained.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

R. Sergent
June 25, 2006


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER